



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/054,628	01/22/2002	Thomas James Klofta	7571RD	7063

27752 7590 01/11/2008
THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DIVISION - WEST BLDG.
WINTON HILL BUSINESS CENTER - BOX 412
6250 CENTER HILL AVENUE
CINCINNATI, OH 45224

EXAMINER

STEPHENS, JACQUELINE F

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3761

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

01/11/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/054,628

Applicant(s)

KLOFTA ET AL.

Examiner

Jacqueline F. Stephens

Art Unit

3761

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10/31/07.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6,8,9,11 and 13-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6,8,9,11 and 13-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 10/31/07 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-6, 8, 9, 11, 13-22 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of

the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims 1-6, 8, 9, 11, and 13-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roe USPN 5609587 in view of Vega USPN 6153209.

As to claims 1, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, and 13-22, Roe discloses the present invention substantially as claimed. However, Roe does not disclose the exact amount of a rheological agent present in the lotion composition. Roe teaches the lotion composition can have optional components, such as a stabilizer (col. 23, lines 35-36). Roe teaches the cellulose derivatives are used as a stabilizer. A rheological agent in a lotion composition generally affects the ability of the composition to flow or be deformed. A stabilizer also affects the deformation of the composition. Therefore, Roe discloses cellulose derivatives as a rheological agent as broadly as claimed.

Roe recognizes the amount of the components can be varied and this will affect the viscosity of the lotion composition (col. 10, lines 38-42). Roe, therefore recognizes the stability of the composition is a result effective variable of percentage of components used, including the percentage of the rheological agent. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the article of

Art Unit: 3761

Roe with the claimed amount of rheological agent, since discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art.

Roe does not disclose the claimed rheological agents. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to use the composite in a non-absorbent application, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416.

The absorbent article comprises:

- a) a vapor permeable backsheet (col. 6, lines 2-3);
- b) a liquid pervious topsheet **520** positioned in facing relation with the backsheet **530**;
- c) an absorbent core **540** located between said backsheet and said topsheet (Roe col. 5, line 66 through col. 6, line 1);
- and d) a skin care composition on at least a portion of a wearer-contacting surface of the absorbent article (Roe Abstract and col. 10, lines 25-31), which comprises from about 10 to about 95 weight percent of an emollient (Roe col. 17, lines 61-64) and from about 5 to about 90 weight percent of a wax (Roe col. 21, lines 35-38). Roe discloses the use of other components, such as stabilizers and viscosity modifiers (col. 23, lines 27-44. Roe/Vega teaches the rheological agent is a suspending agent for suspending

Art Unit: 3761

skin care agents in the composition (Vega col. 27, lines 10-25). Roe/Vega disclose a surfactant in the lotion composition (Roe col. 21, line 40 through col. 23, line 25).

Roe/Vega does not disclose the claimed viscosity and elastic modulus.

However, it is the Examiner's position that the viscosity and elastic modulus is inherent in the structure taught by Roe/Vega since the specification defines an absorbent article having a skin care composition with the same materials taught in Roe/Vega. When the structure recited in the reference is substantially identical to that of the claims of the instant invention, claimed properties or functions are presumed to be inherent (MPEP 2112-2112.01). A *prima facie* case of either anticipation or obviousness has been established when the reference discloses all the limitations of a claim except a property or function and the examiner can not determine whether or not the reference inherently possesses properties which anticipate or render obvious the claimed invention but has basis for shifting the burden of proof as in *In re Fitzgerald*, 619 F.2d 67, 70 205 USPQ 594, 596 (CCPA 1980).

As to claim 2, Roe/Vega discloses the emollient is selected from the claimed group of materials (Roe col. 15, line 47 through col. 16, line 24).

Art Unit: 3761

As to claim 3, Roe/Gale discloses the emollient is a petroleum-based emollient selected from the group consisting of petrolatum, mineral oil, and mixtures thereof (Roe col. 16, lines 6-33).


As to claim 4, Roe/Gale discloses the wax is selected from the group consisting of the claimed materials (Roe col. 21, lines 20-24).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jacqueline F. Stephens whose telephone number is (571) 272-4937. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tanya Zalukaeva can be reached on (571) 272-1115. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3761

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Jacqueline F Stephens
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3761

January 7, 2008